1 2 3 4 5 6	CHRISTOPHER H. MCGRATH (SB# 149129) chrismcgrath@paulhastings.com RAYMOND W. STOCKSTILL, IV (SB# 27522 beaustockstill@paulhastings.com PAUL HASTINGS LLP 695 Town Center Drive Seventeenth Floor Costa Mesa, California 92626-1924 Telephone: 1(714) 668-6200 Facsimile: 1(714) 979-1921	8)	
7	EDWARD HAN (SB# 196924) edwardhan@paulhastings.com PAUL HASTINGS LLP		
8	55 Second Street Twenty-Fourth Floor		
9	San Francisco, CA 94105 Telephone: (415) 856-7000		
10	Facsimile: (415) 856-7100  Attorneys for Defendant Identiv, Inc.		
12	interneys for Defendant racinity, Inc.		
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
14	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
15			
16	RYAN OSWALD, Derivatively on Behalf of Nominal Defendant IDENTIV, INC.,	CASE NO. 3	:16-CV-00241-CRB
17	Plaintiff,		ION AND ORDER PROCEEDINGS
18	VS.		
19	STEVEN HUMPHREYS, JASON HART,		
20 21	JAMES OUSLEY, GARY KREMEN, SAAD ALAZEM, DANIEL S. WENZEL, and BRIAN NELSON,		, 17th Floor Ion. Charles R. Breyer
21 22	Defendants,	Judge. 1.	ion. Charles R. Breyer
23	and		
24	IDENTIV, INC.,		
25	Nominal Defendant.		
26			
27			
28			
		STIPLE	LATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER

1	<u>STIPULATION</u>		
2	Plaintiff Ryan Oswald ("Plaintiff"), Nominal Defendant Identiv, Inc. ("Identiv") and		
3	defendants Brian Nelson and Jason Hart (collectively with Identiv, "Defendants") by and through		
4	counsel, hereby stipulate as follows:		
5	WHEREAS, this is a shareholder derivative action filed on January 14, 2016;		
6	WHEREAS, two other shareholder derivative actions have been filed in the Superior		
7	Court of the State of California, County of Alameda; Chopra v. Hart, et al., Case No. RG-		
8	16801379 (filed on January 24, 2016); Wollnik v. Wenzel, et al., Case No. RG-16803342 (filed on		
9	February 9, 2016) ("State Court Derivative Actions");		
10	WHEREAS, this derivative action is related to a putative class action alleging violations		
11	of federal securities laws: Rok v. Identiv, et al., Case No. 15-cv-05775-CRB (the "Securities Class		
12	Action");		
13	WHEREAS, on January 29, 2016, the Court granted a stipulation in the Securities Class		
14	Action extending the defendants' deadline to respond to the complaint until 45 days after the		
15	court selects a lead plaintiff and said lead plaintiff files an amended complaint;		
16	WHEREAS, the hearing in the Securities Class Action on various motions for lead		
17	plaintiff is set for March 11, 2016;		
18	WHEREAS, Defendants intend to seek stays of the State Court Derivative Actions;		
19	WHEREAS, based upon the circumstances unique to this case, and to avoid the		
20	unnecessary expenditure of judicial resources, the parties to this action have agreed, subject		
21	to this Court's approval, to stay prosecution of this action, including motions practice and		
22	discovery; and		
23	NOW, THEREFORE the parties respectfully request that the Court enter an Order as		
24	follows		
25	1. The case management conference set for March 11, 2016 is vacated.		
26	2. The Company shall respond to the complaint in this action within forty-five (45)		
27	days after the lead plaintiff has filed an amended complaint in the Securities Class Action,		

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER STAYING PROCEEDINGS

plaintiff in this action shall either file an amended complaint or designate an existing complaint as

28

1	operative. Thereafter, the Company, within forty-five (45) days, shall respond by way of either			
2	motion to dismiss on the basis that demand is not excused, or a motion to stay this action until			
3	there is a resolution of the motion to dismiss the Securities Class Action. In the event that			
4	motion to stay this action is denied, the Company's responsive pleading shall be due thirty (30			
5	days after entry of an order denying the motion. The individual defendants in this action need no			
6	respond to the complaint unless and until there is a determination by this Court that demand i			
7	7 excused.	excused.		
8	3. All other proceedings, including motion practice and discovery, in this action ar			
9	9 hereby stayed until further order of the Court. 1	hereby stayed until further order of the Court. <sup>1</sup>		
10	10 IT IS SO STIPULATED.	IT IS SO STIPULATED.		
11				
12	10    '	TT C. SCHUBERT M F. JONCKHEER		
13	13 SCHUB	BERT JONCKHEER & KOLBE LLP		
14	14			
15	15 By: <u>/s/</u>	ROBERT C. SCHUBERT		
16		I. Harwood		
17	17 Matthey	v M. Houston		
18	10 11	in I. Sachs-Michaels OOD FEFFER LLP		
19	19 Attorne	ys for Plaintiff Ryan Oswald		
20		, 3		
21	21			
22	22			
23	23			
24	24			
25	25			
26	26			
27				
28	State Court Derivate Actions, including, but not limit those actions	ted to, seeking stays and/or consolidation of		

those actions.

1	EDWARD H	IER H. McGRATH AN		
2	PAIII HAST	W. STOCKSTILL, IV		
3	3	ITOS ELI		
4		stopher H. McGrath		
5		stopher H. McGrath HRISTOPHER H. McGRATH		
6	Attorneys for	r Defendant Identiv, Inc.		
7	DATED: March 3, 2016 ROBERT P. Y			
8	8 SUTCLIF	ERRINGTON & FE LLP		
9	9			
10	By: <u>/s/ Robe</u>	ert P. Varian		
11	1	ROBERT P. VARIAN		
12	2 Attorneys for	Defendant Jason Hart		
13	JOINTIMIN			
14	4	GASKIN LLP		
15				
16	By: /s/ Jona	than Gaskin JONATHAN GASKIN		
17	Attorneys for	Defendant Brian Nelson		
18		<b>,</b>		
19	9			
20	DECLARATION REGARDING C	CONCURRENCE		
21	I, Christopher H. McGrath, am the ECF User whos	e identification and password are being		
22	used to file the STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORD	ER STAYING PROCEEDINGS. In		
23	compliance with Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I hereby attest that I	Robert C. Schubert, Robert P. Varian		
24	and Jonathan Gaskin have concurred in this filing.	and Jonathan Gaskin have concurred in this filing.		
25	25	H.M.C		
26		ristopher H. McGrath		
27	27 ///			
28	28 ///			
		STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER		

## \* \* \*ORDER\* \* \* PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: March 7, 2016 HONORABLE CHARLES R. BREYER UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

LEGAL\_US\_W # 85094259.5